UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,961	04/15/2004	Dennis W. Minium JR.	MS307028.1/MSFTP636US	7470

27195 7590 08/17/2009

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
HOFFLER, RAHEEM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,961	MINIUM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RAHEEM HOFFLER	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,10-13,16,19-22,28,30,33 & 34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,10-13,16,19-22,28,30,33 & 34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Due to amendment, rejection of Claims 1, 3-8 & 10-13 under 25 USC 101 has been withdrawn. Applicant's submission filed on 12 May 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 33 & 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik et al (USPG Pub No. 20050108200A1; Meik hereinafter) in view of Do et al (USPG-Pub No. 20020170042A1; Do hereinafter) further in view of Rowen et al (USPG Pub No. 20070174113A1; Rowen hereinafter).

As for Claim1, Meik et al teaches of a distributed classification system comprising "a processor" (see paragraph [0083], [0097]; e.g., query processor);

"a memory communicatively coupled to the processor, the memory having stored therein computer executable instructions to implement the system" (see paragraph [0125], [0145]), including:

"a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools, wherein each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components" (see Fig. 1; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0155-0160], [0167-0185]; e.g., filtering module; design tools can be broadly interpreted to be any type of tools or modules or components that interact with the classification system and manipulate objects and information into a desired shape or format)

"a classification component that couples the software components to a common classification structure based on a structure type comprising structure type class that represents a name of the structure type and identifies if the common classification structure is a hierarchy, node types defining at least one type of software component supported by the common classification structure and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationships between the various node types" (see paragraph [0008-0014], [0037], [0122-0129]; e.g., search engine component that performs all of the duties of classification and categorization. As stated, "herein, all steps are executed for a contents-related classification and

categorization of the documents, and the results of this categorization (the so-called "extracts") are permanently stored in a database". As stated within paragraphs [0009-0013], information management tasks concerning the categorization and classification of software components comprise real-time sorting into predefined hierarchies, thematic identification to support topic-specific processing operations, structuring of search and/or browsing techniques, and finding components that refer to task based interests. Also stated, "Nevertheless, the modular architecture of the novel search engine according to the preferred embodiment of the underlying invention is specially equipped for being employed in this field of application. As can be taken from FIG. 12, each document which shall be analyzed, is first submitted to a so-called filtering module" pp [0160]), the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types and wherein a plurality of applications access the software components (see paragraph [0052], [0258], [0262]; e.g., parent-child relationship involving nodes).

"wherein the memory stores the classification component and the coupling between the software components and the common classification structure" (see Fig. 11; see paragraph [0125], [0145]).

The missing of Meik is the limitation, "wherein each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components"

Do explicitly recites the limitation, "wherein each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components" (see Abstract; see paragraph [0074], [0108], [0145], [0148]; e.g., Axiomatic design tools that interact with software components and

manipulate objects into a desired shape or format. They allow a user to populate an axiomatic design equation to determine coupling between elements of a previously developed software system)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the controlling and manipulation of software components by software design tools as taught by Do with classification based interactive system for information retrieval as taught by Meik because it would be beneficial to have a software system and method that would produce and reuse software code in an error-free, efficient, and expedient manner, decreasing cost of development, maintenance cost, and extensive debugging.

Both Meik and Do do not appear to explicitly recite the limitation of, "an event monitoring system that monitors the common classification structure and automatically provides an opportunity to prevent changes to the common classification structure by communicating at least one notification prior to implementing the changes to the common classification structure"

The reference of Rowen appears to explicitly recite the limitation of, "an event monitoring system that monitors the common classification structure and automatically provides an opportunity to prevent changes to the common classification structure by communicating at least one notification prior to implementing the changes to the common classification structure(see paragraphs [0020], [0030-0035], [0041-0046]; e.g., a plurality of engines such as the notification engine and the output interface that

communicates notifications to users and creates opportunities to approve or prevent modifications to objects)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the event monitoring and notification as taught by Rowen with the methods of Do and Meik in order to make changes to plans and approving changes to distributions beyond those generated from the plans in an efficient and controlled manner. (Rowen; paragraph [0005])

As for Claim 3, Meik et al teaches the classification structure is hierarchical (see Abstract; see paragraph [0064-0065], [0095]; e.g., hierarchical structure).

As for Claim 4, Meik et al teaches the software components are associated with classification nodes (see paragraph [0052], [0258], [0262]; e.g., parent-child relationship involving nodes).

As for Claim 6, Meik et al clearly teaches a graphical user interface employable by a user to associate a classification node to at least one of the software components (see paragraph [0186-0190], [0214]; e.g., GUI).

As for Claim 33, Do teaches, "receiving user input regarding a node within the common classification structure via the graphical user interface" (see paragraph [0105-0108]).

As for Claim 34, Do teaches, "the common classification structure is provided to the software design tools as one or more XML documents, wherein nodes comprised in the XML documents are typed in accordance with respective structure types" (see paragraph [0075], [0120]; e.g., XML documents).

Claims 7, 10-12, 16, 20 & 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik et al (USPG Pub No. 20050108200A1; Meik hereinafter) in view of Gargi et al (USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1; Gargi hereinafter) further in view of Do et al (USPG-Pub No. 20020170042A1; Do hereinafter) yet further in view of Rowen et al (USPG Pub No. 20070174113A1; Rowen hereinafter).

As for Claim 11, Meik explicitly recites

"a processor" (see paragraph [0083], [0097]; e.g., query processor);

"a memory communicatively coupled to the processor, the memory having stored therein computer executable instructions to implement the system" (see paragraph [0125], [0145]), including:

"a means for maintaining the common classification scheme to provide a foundation for a cohesive user experience and wherein the plurality of unrelated software design tools access the components. (see Fig. 1 & 4; (see paragraph [0155-0160], [0167-0181], [0186-0190]; e.g., whereas the cohesion of the plurality of modules that perform the tasks of classification and categorization of information at the users request, as well as the utilization of customized user interfaces allowing for the ease of

use in order to locate a desired result while interacting with numerous software applications, is equivalent to Applicant's teachings of providing a cohesive user experience through the inclusion of unrelated software design tools).

The missing of Meik is the limitation of "a means for generating a common classification scheme amongst a plurality of unrelated software tools stored in a computer readable storage medium, wherein the classification…is based on a structure type and comprises structure type class that describes how the plurality of components are arranged into a hierarchy associated with the classification scheme, node types that define types of components that can be included in the hierarchy and structural constraints that define the permissible parent-child relationships between the various node types."

Gargi et al explicitly recites, "a means for generating a common classification scheme amongst a plurality of unrelated software tools stored in a computer readable storage medium, wherein the classification…is based on a structure type and comprises structure type class that describes how the plurality of components are arranged into a hierarchy associated with the classification scheme, node types that define types of components that can be included in the hierarchy (see Abstract; see fig. 6-8; see paragraph [0013], [0043], [0046-0050] & [0072-0075]; e.g., the arrangement of objects is initiated by a segmentation engine) and structural constraints that define the permissible parent-child relationships between the various node types." (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints) define the

permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types"; (see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0096][0105][0113])) and

"wherein the memory stores the classification component and classification of the components" (see Fig. 11; see paragraph [0125], [0145]).

The missing of both Meik and Gargi is the limitation, "the components controlled by the plurality of design tools"

Do explicitly recites the limitation, "a plurality of components controlled by the plurality of design tools" (see Abstract; see paragraph [0074], [0108], [0145], [0148]; e.g., Axiomatic design tools that interact with software components and manipulate objects into a desired shape or format. They allow a user to populate an axiomatic design equation to determine coupling between elements of a previously developed software system)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the controlling and manipulation of software components by software design tools as taught by Do with classification based interactive system for information retrieval as taught by Meik with the organizing a collection of objects as taught by Gargi et al in order to improve the precision of searching, thereby minimizing browse time and false hits without suffering a corresponding reduction in the relevant document recall rate (see Meik; paragraph [0079]).

The missing Meik, Gargi and Do is the limitation, "means for monitoring the plurality of components that automatically communicates notifications to users prior to

implementing modifications to the hierarchy such that users have an opportunity to prevent undesirable changes wherein further notifications are provided to the users upon implementing the modifications to the hierarchy"

The reference of Rowen appears to explicitly recite the limitation of, "means for monitoring the plurality of components that automatically communicates notifications to users prior to implementing modifications to the hierarchy such that users have an opportunity to prevent undesirable changes wherein further notifications are provided to the users upon implementing the modifications to the hierarchy" (see paragraphs [0020], [0030-0035], [0041-0046]; e.g., a plurality of engines such as the notification engine and the output interface that communicates notifications to users and creates opportunities to approve or prevent modifications to objects)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the event monitoring and notification as taught by Rowen with the methods of Do, Gargi and Meik in order to make changes to plans and approving changes to distributions beyond those generated from the plans in an efficient and controlled manner. (Rowen; paragraph [0005])

As for Claim 7, Gargi et al clearly teaches the graphical user interface enables a user drags and drop a displayed representation of the at least one software component onto a displayed representation of the classification node to assign the at least one software component to the classification node." (see Fig. 2 (164) e.g., layout

engine; see paragraph [0085]).

As for Claim 10, Gargi et al clearly teaches a notification component that alerts consumers of the common structure upon committing a change to the common structure" (see Fig. 16 (62-78); (see paragraph [0107][0108][0112] and [0114] ; e.g., notification service)).

As for Claim 12, Gargi explicitly recites, "a graphical user interface allowing a user to drag and drop graphically displayed components onto graphically displayed classification nodes of a displayed structure" (see Fig. 2 (164) e.g., layout engine; see paragraph [0085]).

As for Claim 16, Meik teaches, A computer implemented common classification methodology, comprising:

"employing a processor to execute computer executable instructions stored in memory" (see paragraph [0083], [0097], [0125 & [0145]; e.g., query processor) to perform the following acts:

instantiating a common classification structure for the taxonomy based at least on the structure type" (see Fig. 1 & 4; (see paragraph [0155-0160], [0167-0181], [0186-0190]; e.g., whereas the cohesion of the plurality of modules that perform the tasks of classification and categorization of information at the users request, as well as the utilization of customized user interfaces allowing for the ease of use in order to locate a

desired result while interacting with numerous software applications, is equivalent to Applicant's teachings of providing a cohesive user experience through the inclusion of unrelated software design tools)

"maintaining the taxonomies to facilitate interaction with taxonomy artifacts by the plurality of unrelated software design tools" (see paragraph [0155-0160], [0167-0185]; e.g., filtering module);

Meik does not appear to explicitly recite the limitation of, "receiving user input related to at least one taxonomy based on a structure type comprising a structure type class that holds name of the structure type and identifies if the common classification structure associated with the taxonomy is a hierarchy, node types defining type of artifacts that are to be included in the taxonomy and structural constraints defining permissible parent-child relationship between various node types;

Gargi appears to explicitly recite the limitation of, "receiving user input related to at least one taxonomy based on a structure type comprising a structure type class that holds name of the structure type and identifies if the common classification structure associated with the taxonomy is a hierarchy, node types defining type of artifacts that are to be included in the taxonomy and structural constraints defining permissible parent-child relationship between various node types" (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints);(see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0096][0105][0113]));

The missing of both Meik and Gargi are the limitations of, "wherein each of the design tools controls at least one of the taxonomy artifacts" and "exposing the common classification structure among a plurality of unrelated software design tools as one or more typed XML (Extensible Markup Language) documents wherein the nodes are typed according to the structure type"

Do appears to explicitly recite the limitation, "wherein each of the design tools controls at least one of the taxonomy artifacts" (see Abstract; see paragraph [0074], [0108], [0145], [0148]; e.g., Axiomatic design tools that interact with software components and manipulate objects into a desired shape or format. They allow a user to populate an axiomatic design equation to determine coupling between elements of a previously developed software system)

"exposing the common classification structure among a plurality of unrelated software design tools as one or more typed XML (Extensible Markup Language) documents wherein the nodes are typed according to the structure type" (see paragraph [0075], [0120]; e.g., XML documents).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the controlling and manipulation of software components by software design tools as taught by Do with classification based interactive system for information retrieval as taught by Meik with the organizing a collection of objects as taught by Gargi et al in order to improve the precision of searching, thereby minimizing browse time and false hits without suffering a

corresponding reduction in the relevant document recall rate (see Meik; paragraph [0079]).

Both Meik, Gargi and Do do not appear to explicitly recite the limitation of, "monitoring the common classification structure to detect manipulations of the structure; providing automatic notifications to users upon receiving input manipulating the common classification structure; receiving user feedback in response to the notifications; allowing the manipulation of the common classification structure based on the user feedback; and informing the users of the manipulations to the common classification structure."

The reference of Rowen appears to explicitly recite the limitations of, "monitoring the common classification structure to detect manipulations of the structure" (see paragraph [0030-0032]; e.g., changes detected are recognized by a data modification engine that flags changes as "pending approval");

"providing automatic notifications to users upon receiving input manipulating the common classification structure" (see paragraph [0033-0034]; e.g., a notification engine that notifies users of modifications to objects);

"receiving user feedback in response to the notifications" (see paragraph [0020], [0035], [0041]; e.g., Output interface is a display responsive to the processing device. Receiving responses to requests/notifications);

"allowing the manipulation of the common classification structure based on the user feedback; and informing the users of the manipulations to the common

classification structure." (see paragraph [0042-0046]; e.g., modifications may be approved or denied by business objects within the hierarchical structure that has received notification of changes that were made)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the process response step as taught by Rowen with the methods of Do, Gargi and Meik in order to make changes to plans and approving changes to distributions beyond those generated from the plans in an efficient and controlled manner. (Rowen; paragraph [0005])

As for Claim 20, Meik teaches, "a graphical user interface to the users for generating the taxonomy" (see paragraph [0186-0190], [0214]; e.g., GUI).

As for Claim 21, Gargi teaches, "facilitating association of the taxonomy artifacts to respective node types by receiving an indication of a drag and drop of at least one of the taxonomy artifacts into respective node type" (see Fig. 2 (164) e.g., layout engine; see paragraph [0085]).

Claims 5, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik et al (USPG Pub No. 20050108200A1; Meik hereinafter) in view of Gargi et al

(USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1) further in view of Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1).

As for Claim 5, Meik et al teaches of the use of a hierarchical structure consisting of object types, a graphical user interface, a plurality of software components as well as a plurality of unrelated software design tools in interacting for the purpose of classification and categorization of information.

Gargi et al teaches of organizing a collection of objects through classification nodes, and a segmentation engine (e.g., taxonomy engine). Both Gargi et al and Meik et al fail to explicitly teach of a globally unique identifier (GUID) being incorporated into his art. Omoigui et al teaches of a globally unique identifier (see paragraph [0982]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined a globally unique identifier as taught by Omoigui et al with the organizing a collection of objects as taught by Gargi et al because it is a preferable file naming method, as made hackneyed in the state of the art. (Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1); see paragraph [0982]).

As for Claim 8, Meik et al teaches of a plurality of software components as well as a plurality of unrelated software design tools in interacting for the purpose of classification and categorization of information. Gargi et al teaches of the classification component utilizing statistical analysis related to artificial intelligence to couple software components to the common structure (see Fig. 17 (120); e.g., Business Process

Cockpit; (see paragraph [0043][0110][0112] and [0114])). Both Gargi et al and Meik et al fails to explicitly recite the limitation of heuristics. Omoigui et al teaches heuristics to couple software components to a common structure (see paragraph [0622][1048]).

Claim 13 differs from Claim 8 in that claim 13 is a software tool interaction system whereas claim 8 is a classification system claim. Thus, claim 13 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 8 above.

Claims 28 & 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik et al (USPG Pub No. 20050108200A1; Meik hereinafter) in view of Gargi et al (USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1; Gargi hereinafter) further in view of Rowen et al (USPG Pub No. 20070174113A1; Rowen hereinafter)

As for Claim 28, Meik teaches, A common enterprise classification scheme methodology comprising:

"employing a processor to execute computer executable instructions stored in memory" (see paragraph [0083], [0097], [0125 & [0145]; e.g., query processor) to perform the following acts:

"receiving input related to classifying a plurality of artifacts controlled by a plurality of unrelated software tools in accordance with a taxonomy scheme" (see Fig. 1

(user interface [102]) and (categorizing component [1000]); see paragraph [0040], [0214-0215]; e.g., customer input being received);

Meik does not appear to explicitly recite the limitations of, "instantiating a common structure based on a structure type associated with the received input, the common structure comprising structure type class that details the arrangement of taxonomy artifacts into a hierarchy associated with the common structure, node types which specify types of artifacts that can be included in the common structure and structural constraints which define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types"

Gargi appears to explicitly recite, "instantiating a common structure based on a structure type associated with the received input, the common structure comprising structure type class that details the arrangement of taxonomy artifacts into a hierarchy associated with the common structure, node types which specify types of artifacts that can be included in the common structure (see paragraph [0012], [0072-0076]; whereas Gargi et al teaching of clusters, meta data and hierarchy is equivalent to Applicant's teaching of hierarchy, class and constraints) and structural constraints which define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types" (see Fig. 15; e.g., object types; (see paragraph [0096][0105][0113]));

"exposing the common structure amongst a plurality of unrelated software design tools to facilitate the classification of the artifacts" (see Fig. 1 & 4; (see paragraph [0155-0160], [0167-0181], [0186-0190]; e.g., whereas the cohesion of the plurality of modules

that perform the tasks of classification and categorization of information at the users request, as well as the utilization of customized user interfaces allowing for the ease of use in order to locate a desired result while interacting with numerous software applications, is equivalent to Applicant's teachings of providing a cohesive user experience through the inclusion of unrelated software design tools);

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the organizing a collection of objects as taught by Gargi with the method of Meik in order to improve the quality and efficiency of administrative and production processes, and to rapidly and reliably deliver services to businesses and individual customers. (Gargi; paragraph [0009])

Both Meik and Gargi do not appear to explicitly recite the limitations of, "detecting one or more changes to the common structure"; "automatically notifying one or more of users or owners of the artifacts regarding changes to the common structure"; "receiving feedback from the owners or users regarding the notifications"; "preventing changes to the common structure if the users or owners veto the changes in the feedback", "implementing the changes if no veto is received"; and "informing the owners and users of the changes implemented to the common structure".

The reference of Rowen appears to explicitly recite the limitations of, "detecting one or more changes to the common structure" (see paragraph [0030-0032]; e.g., changes detected are recognized by a data modification engine that flags changes as "pending approval");

"automatically notifying one or more of users or owners of the artifacts regarding changes to the common structure" (see paragraph [0033-0034]; e.g., a notification engine that notifies users of modifications to objects);

"receiving feedback from the owners or users regarding the notifications" (see paragraph [0020], [0035], [0041]; e.g., Output interface is a display responsive to the processing device. Receiving responses to requests/notifications);

"preventing changes to the common structure if the users or owners veto the changes in the feedback", "implementing the changes if no veto is received"; and "informing the owners and users of the changes implemented to the common structure" (see paragraph [0042-0046]; e.g., modifications may be approved or denied by business objects within the hierarchical structure that has received notification of changes that were made)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the process response step as taught by Rowen with the methods of Gargi and Meik in order to make changes to plans and approving changes to distributions beyond those generated from the plans in an efficient and controlled manner. (Rowen; paragraph [0005])

As for Claim 30, Meik et al clearly teaches, "the common structure is exposed *via a* graphical user interface" (see paragraph [0186-0190], [0214]; e.g., GUI).

Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik et al (USPG Pub No. 20050108200A1; Meik hereinafter) in view of Gargi et al (USPG-Pub No. 20050027712A1) further in view of Do et al (USPG-Pub No. 20020170042A1; Do hereinafter) yet further in view of Rowen et al (USPG Pub No. 20070174113A1; Rowen hereinafter) even further in view of Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1).

As for Claim 19, Meik et al teaches of a plurality of software components as well as a plurality of unrelated software design tools in interacting for the purpose of classification and categorization of information. Gargi et al teaches of node (e.g., classification nodes; see paragraph [0106][0107]) in a taxonomy (e.g., object cluster or group; see paragraph [0049]). Do teaches of the controlling and manipulation of software components by software design tools. Rowen teaches of the process response step.

Gargi, Meik, Do and Rowen all do not appear to explicitly recite the integration of a globally unique identifier (GUID).

Omoigui appears to explicitly recite the limitation of a globally unique node identifier (see paragraph [0982]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined a globally unique identifier as taught by Omoigui et al with the methods of Rowen, Do, Meik & Gargi because it is a preferable

file naming method, as made hackneyed in the state of the art. (Omoigui et al (USPG-Pub No. 20030126136A1); see paragraph [0982]).

As for Claim 22, Omoigui teaches, "employing heuristics and statistical analyses related to artificial intelligence" (see paragraph [0622][1048]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 3-13, 16, 19-22, 28, 30 & 33 have been fully considered but are considered moot in view of the new grounds of rejection as well as newly found citations within the original grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of reference and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Horn et al (US Patent No. 7013289B2) teaches a global electronic commerce system.

Kiessig et al (US Patent No. 7386530B2) teaches a system and method for managing content including addressability features.

Goodman et al (US Patent No. 7020697B1) teaches architectures for netcentric computing systems.

Ebert et al (USPG Pub No. 20030227392A1) teaches a context-aware and real-time item tracking system.

Hoffberg et al (US Patent No. 6850252B1) teaches an intelligence electronic appliance system and method.

Banerjee et al (US Patent No. 6980983B2) teaches a method for collective decision-making.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAHEEM HOFFLER whose telephone number is (571)270-1036. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached on (571) 272-4074. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165